



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GIFTS TO UNIVERSITIES.—“Under no circumstances should, or can, any self-respecting university accept a gift upon conditions which fix or hamper its complete freedom in the control of its own educational policies and activities. To accept a gift on condition that a certain doctrine or theory be taught or be not taught, or on condition that a certain administrative policy be pursued or be not pursued, is to surrender a university’s freedom and to strike a blow at what should be its characteristic independence. Indeed, any donor who would venture to attempt to bind a university, either as to the form or the content of its teaching or as to its administrative policies, would be a dangerous person. Unless the public can have full faith in the intellectual and moral integrity of its universities and complete confidence that they direct and are responsible for their own policies, there can be no proper and helpful relationship between the universities and the public. A university may accept a gift to extend and improve its teaching of history, but it may not accept a gift to put a fixed and definite interpretation, good for all time, upon any facts of history. A university may accept a gift to increase the salaries of its professors, but it may not accept a gift for such purpose on condition that the salaries of professors shall never exceed a stated maximum, or that some professors shall be restricted as others are not in their personal, literary, or scientific activities. No university is so poor that it can afford to accept a gift which restricts its independence and no university is so rich that it would not be impoverished by an addition to its resources which tied the hands of its governing board.”—*Nicholas Murray Butler, Annual Report, 1919.*

NATIONAL SURVEY OF STATE UNIVERSITIES.—“ . . . Public higher education has progressed to the point where it is imperative that the maladjustment of educational facilities to regional and national requirements be remedied, that the function and spread of state higher institutions and their relationships to other educational agencies be redefined, and that a unified and consistent national policy for the development of higher education be outlined which will commend itself to the institutions concerned. A series of studies genuinely national in scope must underlie these determinations. For example, there must be investiga-

tions of the actual and potential resources of the states and of the nation that may be utilized for educational purposes; there must be estimates of the educational needs of given areas and communities much more careful and complete than any that have yet been attempted; there must be studies of the actual content and results of certain kinds of professional training, studies of the various experiments in reorganizing the administrative units of the educational system. The composite total if properly brought together and interpreted might pass for a national survey of state universities. But it would be more than that. It ought not to be undertaken unless more is contemplated. The separated land-grant colleges and teacher-training agencies are parts of the higher educational systems of all states and must be considered along with the state universities in determining state or national policies in the field of higher education. . . .

" . . . Personally I think that the need for studies of this sort is the strongest argument for the creation of a Federal Department of Education. . . .

"It is probably clear to every administrator here that state institutions are reaching the limit of support from public funds under prevailing conditions of valuation and taxation of property. . . .

"Since the staffs of state higher institutions generally contain the leading local experts on economics and government, it seems obvious that the obligation rests upon state institutions to enlighten the public as to this emergency and to suggest practical remedies. . . .

"Specifically, then, I propose that this Association appoint a committee to consider the investigation by officers of the state-supported institutions in each state of the existing systems of state taxation. The Association should request the Association of Land Grant Colleges to appoint a similar committee, because in this matter the interests of state universities and land-grant colleges, where these institutions are separated, are identical. But this Association may properly take the initiative since the departments of economics and government in separated land-grant colleges are generally service departments and hence not so strongly developed. The joint committee's task would be, after general outline of the field, to suggest to the appropriate

institution of each state the kind of studies which might be made by their professors and advanced students. The joint committee would in the end bring together and interpret the results.

"The financial emergency now transcends all other problems. All state universities need more money than they are likely to get in the immediate future. As has been suggested, the potential supply is sharply limited by existing systems of taxation. This fact, coupled with the enormously increased demands made by university boards on public appropriating bodies, has led these bodies to insist upon the utmost economy in the expenditure of sums granted. I suspect there is a very general belief that universities are wastefully run. One encounters expression of this belief everywhere. The situation is not as bad as the lay critics think it is, but we must all admit that there is some measure of justification for the widespread conviction that part of the public money devoted to educational purposes goes to waste. It is clear that the existence of this conviction cannot safely be ignored. University officers should be prepared to demonstrate that the funds entrusted to them are used to the utmost advantage. This was always important. It is especially important now.

"I have happened to investigate the unit costs in several state institutions. This is not the place to indicate details, but those investigations revealed that it was possible for the institutions under consideration to effect very substantial savings by a more scientific distribution of the teaching load, more systematic use of building space, better classification of expenditures, and a more businesslike method of cost accounting in general. In the last few years a number of institutions have made still more searching analyses of the costs of every university function which abundantly prove the feasibility of large economies without diminishing the efficiency of either teaching or research. . . .

". . . The domain of higher education has now become so broad that no institution, no matter how wealthy, can occupy it all. No university can any longer be universal. Every university must to a certain degree specialize. Its offerings must be adjusted to the needs of its constituents. As the field of knowledge continues to expand and professional specialties continue to multiply, certain universities will be forced to provide

new lines of training as yet unforeseen. If they are to serve their constituencies adequately with the money available, they must likewise be prepared to drop those divisions or departments, the maintenance of which cannot be justified on the ground of educational necessity.

"These considerations suggest that the public higher institutions should study the national aspects of enterprise in which they are engaged. My third and final recommendation to this body is, therefore, that it participate in a kind of preliminary or superficial survey of the distribution of opportunities for advanced and professional training at higher institutions throughout the country. Obviously other groups of institutions would be as much interested in such a survey as the members of this Association, for example, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers Colleges, and the Association of National Schools, and perhaps the Association of Medical Colleges and the Association of Law Schools. You are probably aware that all of these associations except one are represented in the American Council on Education. The principal object for which the Council was founded was 'to promote and carry out cooperative action in matters of common interest to the associations represented.' Consequently I would suggest, if this proposition meets with your approval, that the National Association of State Universities petition the American Council on Education in terms somewhat as follows:

"That the Council appoint a joint committee composed of representatives of the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers Colleges, and such other groups of professional institutions as seem to be concerned, to undertake a preliminary survey of the distribution of facilities for professional training and graduate study in public and private institutions in the United States, and that the Council be requested to ask the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Education in prosecuting the study.'"—*S. P. Capen, Transactions of the National Association of State Universities, 1920.*

THE FAILURE OF THE COLLEGE.—" . . . Where it is making its egregious blunder is in attempting to educate these three classes together. . . .